



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE CUBAN RESOLUTIONS.

The attempted action of Congress in regard to the recognition of Cuban belligerency is already known and discussed throughout the country, in fact throughout the world. The salient features can be briefly given.

On the 28th of February, by a vote of 64 to 6, the Senate passed a concurrent resolution brought in by the Committee on Foreign Affairs declaring that the Cuban insurgents ought to be recognized as belligerents and that the friendly offices of the United States should be offered for the recognition of Cuban independence. Here is the resolution in full :

Resolved, by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring) that, in the opinion of Congress, a condition of public war exists between the government of Spain and the government proclaimed and for some time maintained by force of arms by the people of Cuba: and that the United States of America should maintain a strict neutrality between the contending powers, according to each and all the rights of belligerents in the ports and territory of the United States.

Resolved further, that the friendly offices of the United States should be offered by the President to the Spanish government for the recognition of the independence of Cuba.

On the 2d of March, "the Cuban hurricane," as it has been called, passed over the House of Representatives, and by a vote of 263 to 17 the following resolutions reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs were passed :

Resolved, by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring) that in the opinion of Congress a state of public war exists in Cuba, the parties to which are entitled to belligerent rights, and the United States should observe a strict neutrality between the belligerents.

Resolved, that Congress deplores the destruction of life and property caused by the war now waging in that island, and believing that the permanent solution of the contest, equally in the interest of Spain, the people of Cuba, and other nations, would be in the establishment of a government by the choice of the people of Cuba, it is the sense of Congress that the government of the United States should use its good offices and friendly influence to that end.

Resolved, that the United States has not intervened in struggles between any European governments and their colonies on this continent; but from the very close relations between the people of the United States and those of Cuba, in consequence of its proximity and the extent of the commerce between the two peoples, the present war is entailing such losses upon the people of the United States, that Congress is of opinion that the government of the United States should be prepared to protect the legitimate interests of our citizens by intervention, if necessary.

These resolutions were passed by the House under suspension of the rules, with but *seventy minutes* given to their consideration. The entire Massachusetts delegation present voted against them, together with a number of other New England men, on the ground of the hasty method of rushing them through. They were also passed in face of the well known fact that the President and Secretary of State held that the time had not come for recognizing the Cubans as belligerents, and for this reason they were put into the form of concurrent resolutions, instead of joint, which latter would have required action on the part of the President.

It is certainly pertinent to ask what conceivable good Senators and Representatives supposed would come of the

mere expression of opinion given at break-neck speed without thorough investigation, when it was known that this would lead to the doing of nothing.

The immediate effect of the vote in the two Houses was to arouse bitter feeling toward the United States throughout Spain, and a determination to prosecute the war in Cuba to the bitter end. American officials in Madrid and other cities were put in jeopardy of their lives, and had to be protected by the authorities.

The action of the two Houses appears still worse in the light of later developments. The House not having accepted the Senate's form of resolution, nor the Senate that of the House, the subject went to conference, where the House form was adopted. When the resolutions came again before the Senate, Senator Hale objected to their being rushed through without due consideration. In the debates which followed, led by Senators Hale and Hoar in a manner worthy of American Senators, it was made clear that the evidence on which the Foreign Affairs Committee had acted when it first brought in its resolution was of a very one-sided and uncertain character, and not at all such as to justify the hasty action taken by both Houses if indeed it justified any action at all at the time. The opposition to the conference report on account of the intervention clause, and for other general reasons, became so strong in the Senate that it was finally referred back to conference, in spite of Senator Sherman's efforts to get it passed. The probability at the present writing is that a new resolution, stripped of the intervention clause, will be brought in and possibly passed by both Houses, though opposition to this course of action has steadily developed in both bodies.

It is gratifying to know that, in the midst of the general rashness and meddlesomeness a few men in the national legislature have been wise and strong enough to bring it back to some sense of the great and solemn responsibility resting upon it. The course which Congress has taken has probably closed the door for the doing of anything effective for Cuba, if the time for it should ever have come. Any resolution passed now will be practically without force, if not positively harmful. The anger of Spain has been allayed by the course pursued by Senators Hale and Hoar, with the support of many others, but she will be hereafter more inaccessible to any friendly appeals in behalf of Cuba on the part of the Executive.

Nobody could be more strongly in favor of Cuban independence than we. The island ought to be a free and independent republic. The Cuban people may be poorly fitted at present to control themselves, but they will never learn self-government except by governing themselves. But their liberty and independence will not be promoted by our rashness and sentimental meddlesomeness. It is deplorable to see our nation falling into such a spirit and such inconsiderateness of action as must necessarily, if not speedily abandoned, bring republican institutions into

bad repute, and make it impossible for the United States to exercise that great and generous influence in behalf of liberty and peace which is a part of her world-wide mission.

THE LONDON PEACE DEMONSTRATION.

On the evening of March 3rd a demonstration in favor of a permanent system of arbitration between Great Britain and the United States was held in Queen's Hall, London. It does not seem to have reached the proportions of the demonstration in Philadelphia on Washington's birthday, but its influence was not necessarily less on that account. The eminent men and women who took part in it, or wrote letters approving its aims gave it a national character.

Sir James Stansfeld presided over the meeting, and was supported by Mr. W. T. Stead, Lady Henry Somerset, Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella, Radical member of Parliament for Sheffield; Professor James Bryce, Rt. Hon. George Shaw-Lefevre, Mr. Hall Caine, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes, the Bishop of Rochester and others.

Mr. Stead, after the opening of the meeting, read letters of sympathy with its purpose from Mr. A. J. Balfour, first lord of the treasury; Mr. Gladstone, Rt. Hon. Henry Asquith, home secretary in the late Liberal Government; Mr. Labouchere, George Meredith, the author; Mr. Henry Norman, who went to Washington on behalf of the *Chronicle*, at the time the Venezuelan question was at its acute phase and who wrote strongly from there in behalf of international arbitration, and many others.

Mr. Balfour wrote: "My sympathy with the object of the meeting has been more than once expressed in public, and I hope I need not emphasize it. There are, no doubt, questions that a nation could not permit to be settled by any tribunal. But this argument is not against arbitration but against its rash and unconsidered use."

Mr. Gladstone wrote: "I am glad that the discussion of arbitration is to be separated from the Venezuelan question, upon which I do not feel myself in final and full possession of the facts that I should wish. My views on arbitration in place of war were gathered from the part I took in the matter of the Alabama claims. I will only add that my conviction and sentiment on the subject grow in strength from year to year in proportion to the growth of the monstrous and barbarous militarism, in regard to which I consider that England has to bear no small share of the responsibility."

Mr. Henry Norman said in his letter: "The Americans are practically unanimous for arbitration on all subjects. The overwhelming majority of the British are the same. Only official conservatism blocks the way. Is this the moment to pigeon-hole in the Foreign Office a draft of a treaty of arbitration with the United States?"

Similar letters were read from Herbert Spencer, Holman Hunt, Wilson Barrett, the actor; William Watson, the poet; Viscount Peel, ex-Speaker of the House of Commons; Leonard Courtney, Alma Tadema, C. F. Watts, Dr. Parker, and several bishops.

Mr. Shaw-Lefevre moved a resolution instructing the chairman to sign a memorial on behalf of the meeting to President Cleveland, the Marquis of Salisbury and Mr. Balfour, urging that the time was opportune to conclude a treaty of arbitration. The Bishop of Rochester seconded this motion, and Lady Henry Somerset supported it with an impassioned denunciation of war between England and America. Mr. Hall Caine, Rev. Hugh Price Hughes and others spoke on the resolution, which was then carried by acclamation. Rt. Hon. A. J. Mundella then moved a resolution requesting that the committee be convened in a meeting to reconstitute it on a national basis, with a view to co-operate with the Washington movement. This motion was carried unanimously, and the meeting terminated with the singing of the national anthem.

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND PEACE.*

Students and others who are interested in the history of international law and its codification and reform will find the recently published work of Professor T. J. Lawrence of Cambridge, England, a fresh and valuable book. It is probably as complete a statement in a condensed way of the principles and present general practices of international law as is now accessible. The work is divided into four parts. The first treats of the Nature and History of International Law, the second of the Law of Peace, the third of the Law of War, and the fourth of the Law of Neutrality.

International Law is confessedly a difficult subject to write about. Professor Lawrence says it "may be regarded as a living organism, which grows with the growth of experience and is shaped in the last resort by the ideas and aspirations current among civilized men." He allows that its rules, as actually in practice, are to be determined by the historic method, but contends that "ethical principles should be put prominently forward by all writers who deal with" the controversies which are constantly arising between nations, out of the discussion of which comes the growth and improvement of international law. It is unquestionable that these ethical principles are today being applied to the subject as never before, and that their vigorous application is rapidly transforming the whole body of international law. One cannot, however, read Professor Lawrence's chapters on the "Law of War," without seeing that there is yet much to do in this direction. The application of moral principles through international law has already done much to remove some of the atrocities of war, and to render its occurrence less frequent. The further application of these principles will ultimately remove the "great atrocity" itself, and make it unnecessary for writers on interna-

*The Principles of International Law. By T. J. Lawrence, M. A., LL. D., Rector of Girton College, Cambridge, England. D. C. Heath & Co., Publishers, Boston.